

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's final Action dated February 13, 2008, and the Advisory Action dated May 1, 2008. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11 and 24 have been amended, and Claim 2 has been canceled, without intending to abandon or to dedicate to the public any patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Claims 1, 3-16 and 24-29 are now pending. As set forth herein, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,453,349 to Kano et al. ("Kano"). In addition, Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Kano in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0114889 to Schneider et al. ("Schneider"). In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 to be proper, each and every element as set forth in a claim must be found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. (MPEP §2131.) In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under §103, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the prior art reference or references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (MPEP §2134.) However, all of the claim elements cannot be found in the cited references, whether those references are considered alone or in combination. In particular, the cited references do not disclose an exchange of packets that contain both: 1) a resource reservation message, and 2) a connection request object as claimed. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims as anticipated by or obvious in view of the cited references are respectfully requested.

The claimed invention allows a request for the reservation of network resources and for the establishment of a connection between end points on the network to be initiated using a single data packet that contains both the request to reserve network resources and the request to establish a connection. In addition, embodiments of the claimed invention allow subsequent messages, for example confirming the reservation of resources and the establishment of a connection, to be sent from an end point that received the first combined data packet to the end point that sent the first combined data packet. Such confirmation is sent in a second data packet that comprises both the confirmation of the requested reservation of resources and confirmation of the requested connection. Accordingly, embodiments of the present invention can provide

efficiencies as compared to conventional methods for establishing connections between endpoints using reserved network resources.

In particular, the amended claims specify that a first data packet is created that contains: 1) a message requesting a reservation of network resources, and 2) an object comprising a connection request. This packet is sent from a first communication endpoint or network device. In response, the first communication endpoint or network device receives a second data packet that contains: 1) a resource reservation message, and 2) a connection request acknowledgement. Accordingly, a communication channel and a reservation of network resources can be established by exchanging a single set of data packets between communication endpoints or network devices. This is in contrast to the prior art, where connection requests and requests to reserve network resources are sent in separate data packets.

The Kano reference is generally directed to an apparatus for a method for resource reservation in a network system. Kano includes discussion of an arrangement by which the receiving terminal reserves network resources, rather than the typical arrangement in which a sending terminal reserves resources on a network. (Kano, col. 3, ll. 10-13.) However, Kano does not teach, suggest or describe sending a response packet that contains both a resource reservation message and a connection request acknowledgement. Instead, Kano discusses sending an acknowledgement message related to a connection request and a separate accept message related to a reservation request. (Kano, col. 2, ll. 16-33.) In the Advisory Action, the Examiner makes reference to col. 4, ll. 30-42 of Kano. This portion of Kano discusses receiving a resource reservation request message and comparing the resource reservation value stored in that message to the resources required to be reserved. Completely absent from this portion of Kano (or any other portion) is disclosure of including an object related to a connection request in the packet containing the resource reservation value. Therefore, Kano does not describe a data packet that contains both a connection request object and a resource reservation message, and the rejections of Claims 1-3, 5-16 and 23-29 as being anticipated by Kano should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 4, which is rejected as being obvious over Kano in view of Schneider, recites that the objects included in the data packets that also comprise network reservation messages comprise session initiation protocol messages. As explained above, the Kano reference does not teach, suggest or describe providing a resource reservation message and a connection request

acknowledgement in a single data packet. The Schneider reference has been cited for discussing the use of session initiation protocol messages. Schneider does discuss a connection setup request in accordance with the session initiation protocol. However, there is no teaching, suggestion or description in Schneider of providing a data packet including a resource reservation message and a connection request acknowledgement. Moreover, Kano is merely an example of the separate establishment of a reservation of network resources by a receiving terminal and Schneider is merely an example of the establishment of a connection request using a conventional protocol. One of ordinary skill in the art, when presented with these references, would not arrive at the claimed invention. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 4 as obvious should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The application now appearing to be in form for allowance, early notification of same is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if doing so would be of assistance.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: 

Bradley M. Knepper
Registration No. 44,189
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202-5141
(303) 863-9700

Date: May 17, 2008